

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11-23 and 41-54 are pending in this application. Claims 11-23 and 41-53 have been rejected, and claim 54 has been added. Claims 11, 21-23, 41, 43, 47, and 49 have been amended, and such amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification and drawings. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and review of the below arguments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-23 and 41-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puri with Patent No. 6,064,982 in view of Christenson et al. with Patent No. 5,926,817. The references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as required by MPEP § 2143. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 11 and 43 recite downloading a subset of available viability-checking tools from a server to a client, eliciting selection of product attributes from a user, performing preliminary viability checking on the client of those selected attributes based on the subset of tools, and then performing a full viability check of the selected attributes on the server. See, claim 11 (“downloading to the client from the server only limited configuration information that is a subset of the full set of configuration information...preliminarily checking the viability of the desired technical configuration of the desired product...wherein the limited configuration programs verify conformity of the user selections for the option attributes with the limited option rules...performing a full check at the server on the viability of the desired technical configuration, wherein the full set of configuration programs verify conformity of the user selections for the option attributes with the full set of option rules”); see also, claim 43 (“transmitting only a limited configuration engine to the client...preliminarily checking the viability of the vehicle configuration of the desired vehicle at the client, wherein the client verifies the conformity of the user selections for the limited set of option attributes with the limited set of option rules...performing a full viability check of the vehicle configuration at the server, wherein the software of the full configuration engine verifies conformity of the user selections for the limited set of option attributes with the full set of option rules”).

Puri and Christenson fail to teach or suggest these limitations. Puri, which allegedly teaches these limitations, discloses a “smart configurator” that determines the viability of products *ex ante* and then offers those products to the user for selection (Fig. 5) rather than accepting elicited product attributes from a user and then checking those attributes *ex post* for viability as claimed. See, e.g., Col. 3, lines 61-66 (“...the smart configurator determines the appropriate hardware requirements to run the software in an acceptable fashion (108) and displays this information on the workstation display”); Col. 5, lines 13-15 (“as generalized statements are selected until the smart configurator suggests more specific statements until the customer’s needs are thoroughly and accurately assesse. [sic]”); Col. 5, lines 63-65 (“The actual hardware requirements for a particular software solution are automatically determined by the smart configurator”). Nowhere does the reference teach or suggest first eliciting from a user actual product attributes—as opposed to the “customer needs”—and then performing preliminary and full viability checking on those attributes. Further, Christenson does not teach or suggest modifying Puri to achieve this limitation.

The cited references further fail to teach or suggest performing two distinct stages of viability checking: (1) a first stage of preliminary checking performed on a client with a subset of tools downloaded to the client from a server, and (2) a second stage of checking performed on the server with a full set of tools. Examiner cites to Puri at col. 6, lines 20-22, as teaching this latter stage, i.e., the full viability check (“the smart configurator provides a proposal template that merges various customer related information into a generic proposal.”). However, nowhere does the reference teach or suggest the smart configurator performs this step on a server and performs a distinct preliminary check on a client as claimed. Moreover, the reference fails to teach or suggest performing two distinct stages of viability checking on user-selected product attributes, as claimed, as opposed to smart configurator-selected attributes. Further, Christenson does not teach or suggest modifying Puri to achieve this limitation.


For at least the forgoing reasons, claim 54 is also allowable.

For at least these reasons, this application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Customer Number 25763

Date: 3/29/05

By:   
Min (Amy) S. Xu, Reg. No. 39,536  
Intellectual Property Department  
Suite 1500  
50 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498  
(612) 752-7367